

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION

JOHN SPATES,

Plaintiff,

v.

DARREN DOUGLAS,

Defendant.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

NO. 3:18-cv-01305
JUDGE RICHARDSON

ORDER

Pending before the Court is a Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 54), addressing “Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment” (Doc. No. 44) filed by Defendant Darren Douglas, to which no Objections have been filed.

The failure to object to a report and recommendation releases the Court from its duty to independently review the matter. *Frias v. Frias*, No. 2:18-cv-00076, 2019 WL 549506, at * 2 (M.D. Tenn. Feb. 12, 2019); *Hart v. Bee Property Mgmt.*, Case No. 18-cv-11851, 2019 WL 1242372, at * 1 (E.D. Mich. March 18, 2019) (citing *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985)). The district court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, those aspects of the report and recommendation to which no objection is made. *Ashraf v. Adventist Health System/Sunbelt, Inc.*, 322 F. Supp. 3d 879, 881 (W.D. Tenn. 2018); *Benson v. Walden Security*, Case No. 3:18-cv-0010, 2018 WL 6322332, at * 3 (M.D. Tenn. Dec. 4, 2018). The district court should adopt the magistrate judge’s findings and rulings to which no specific objection is filed. *Id.*

The Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation and the file. The Report and Recommendation is adopted and approved. Accordingly, Defendant Darren Douglas's motion for summary judgment (Doc. No. 44) is **GRANTED**, and this action is **DISMISSED**¹ with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


ELI RICHARDSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ The only Defendant besides Darren Douglas who had not previously been dismissed is Andrew Jones. (Doc. Nos. 13, 21), who was never served with process. (Doc. Nos. 17 and 23).